

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

TRON-HAUKEBO,

Plaintiff,

V.

CLALLAM COUNTY, et al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 24-cv-5051 BHS

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on pro se plaintiff Anders Tron-Haukebo's 0, 2024, motion for summary judgment, Dkt. 28. The Court denied his last such on May 7, explaining that a party seeking summary judgment must provide sible evidence and argument in support of his position, demonstrating that there are tial issues of fact and that the party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. 7 at 2–5. It also explained that a pro se litigant must follow the Federal Rules of Procedure, and if he fails to do so, the Court will deny his motions and claims. *Id.*

Tron-Haukebo filed another summary judgment motion three days later. Dkt. 28.

21 It contains no evidence, and no legal analysis or argument. Instead, his current summary
22 judgment motion states, in its entirety:

1 The plaintiff respectfully asks the court for a resolution of his MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT
2 and

2 Requests a prompt resolution.

3 Plaintiff further states that he requests to appear in person at a hearing on the above matter and be
4 given prior notice of date and time of five (5) court days or more of said Hearing.

5 Dkt. 28 at 2.

6 This does not comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this District's
7 Local Rules, or this Court's prior Orders. There is no need for a response, and there is no
8 need for a hearing. Tron-Haukebo's motion is plainly deficient, and it is **DENIED**.

9 Tron-Haukebo should refrain from filing similarly unsupported motions in the
10 future.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated this 17th day of May, 2024.

13
14 
15 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
16 United States District Judge